

Appl. No. 10/694,078
Response dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of Nov. 23, 2005

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 4 and 5. These sheets, which includes Figs. 4 and 5, replaces the original sheets for these figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on November 23, 2005. At that time, claims 1-31 were pending in the application. In the Office Action, the Examiner requested amendments to the drawings and the specification. The Office Action also indicated that claims 6 and 15-19 contained allowable subject matter. However, the remaining claims, were rejected based upon the prior art. Likewise, claim 29 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

By this paper, the specification and drawings have been amended. Claim 29 has also been amended to address the concerns under § 112. More importantly, however, the independent claims have been amended to incorporate the language of allowable claim 6. The inclusion of this claim language in the independent claims means that such claims are also allowable.

Accordingly, based upon this paper, Applicants submit that the present case is in a condition for immediate allowance.

Objection to the Specification

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification based upon a typographical error contained therein. As a result of this paper, this error has been corrected. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 29 Under § 112

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In response to this rejection, Applicants have (in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion), amended this claim to recite that the folding portion of the cushion is between the diffuser and the housing. Applicants believe that such a change to the claim language obviates any potential concerns under § 112. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections of the Claims Based Upon the Prior Art

Claims 1-5, 7-14, and 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 based upon the prior art noted by the Examiner. In response to this rejection, Applicants have amended the independent

Appl. No. 10/694,078
Response dated February 15, 2006
Reply to Office Action of Nov. 23, 2005

claims to incorporate the language of claim 6, which language was noted by the Examiner as being allowable. The incorporation of this claim language into the independent claims means that all of the pending claims are likewise allowable. Withdrawal of all rejections under § 102 is respectfully requested.

Amendments to the Drawings

In accordance with the Examiner's instructions, Figures 4 and 5 have been corrected so that the diffuser panels (80a and 80b) are no longer outside of the airbag, as is taught in Applicants' specification. These changes are found on the accompanying replacement sheets. In light of these changes, withdrawal of this drawing objection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If there are any remaining issues preventing allowance of the pending claims that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Sally J. Brown
Reg. No. 37,788
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: February 15, 2006

Autoliv ASP, Inc.
3350 Airport Road
Ogden, Utah 84405
Telephone: (801) 625-4994